

**CLARK COUNTY
CLEAN WATER COMMISSION
Revised Meeting Notes**

Wednesday, July 2, 2003

6:30 – 8:30 PM

Amboy Grange

40107 NE 221st Avenue

Amboy, WA

Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Present

Robbie Agard, Susan Rasmussen, Don Stienke, Art Stubbs, and Virginia vanBreeman

Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Absent

Anne Jackson, Mary Martin, Bill Owen, Judy Schramm,

Clark County Public Works Staff

Kelli Frost, Sam Giese, and Earl Rowell

Audience

James Courtney, Carl Goetz, Linda Goetz, Mary Mitchell, William Mott, John Wolford, and Ralph Wolford

Call to Order

Introduction

The members of the Clark County Clean Water Commission, audience, and Clark County staff were introduced. The meeting was then called to order.

Agenda and material review

The material for the meeting include:

1. 7/2/03 Clark County Clean Water Commission meeting agenda
2. 6/4/03 Clark County Clean Water Commission meeting notes
3. 6/17/03 BOCC and Clean water Commission Luncheon Notes
4. Memo from Auditors office regarding Clean Water Program Audit

6/4/03 meeting notes

The 6/4/03 Clean Water Commission meeting notes was approved as amended.

Communications with the public, media, and/or agencies

Mr. Rowell stated that over the last year and a half Water Resources staff has worked with the Clark County Auditor's office regarding an audit of the Clean Water Program. The audit is complete and the audit report is available on Clark County's web page, or through the Auditor's office. The Auditor's office will provide a presentation of the Clean Water Program audit at the August 6, 2003 Clean Water Commission meeting.

Mr. Rowell mentioned that the Clean Water Commission would have an opportunity to view capital improvement projects and monitoring projects in mid-August. A sign up sheet was circulated among the Commissioners.

Public Comments

Mr. Mott addressed the Clean Water Commissioners regarding the clean water fee structure for Clark County. Charges shall be based on relative contribution to increased surface and stormwater runoff from developed parcels.

Mr. Mott: One of the things that the rate structure, in Clark County, does not address is actual runoff coming from a property. It seeks to find a rate structure that is based simply on impervious surface. I understand that each project can't be looked at individually, but there should be some way of weighing and balancing the actual effect of surface runoff that comes from property.

Mr. Mott: One of the things that has been done for single-family residences and a residential large lot is a discount. No discount is given for retail or commercial parcels.

Mr. Mott: I looked at King County's rate structure. They have a fee structure based on impervious surface and a percentage of impervious surfaces on the project. King County also provides credits for water control facilities, and water quality treatment facilities. Credits are given for use of pervious surfaces that absorb run-off from the impervious surfaces. Credits are given to open space, and low intensity development on large parcels. Many of these are things that Green Mountain Golf Course does. The water that comes off our property, to my knowledge, is in better shape than what comes on our property. For this and a number of other reasons I feel the Clark County code should be re-written, not only to provide an incentive program, but to charge fair and equitable rates.

Mr. Agard: I want to thank you for bringing this to our attention. There is a lot of good information here and I didn't have a chance to go through it before the meeting. The fee that is collected is not to treat any water on your property, it is to clean the streets to and from your place. The money goes to clean up county streets and public facilities.

Mr. Agard: The original committee was formed to come up with a reasonable way to charge everyone equally to clean up the public streets and streams.

Mr. Agard: I have some information I would like to share with the board regarding incentives and I would like to have time to review the information that Mr. Mott provided.

Motion: 2003070205: Mr. Agard, I move that we put this on the next agenda so the whole board has time to read it all.

Motion approved by all Clean Water Commissioners.

Ms. Rassmussen: We will review this information and discuss it at the August Clean Water Commission meeting.

Mr. Stienke: One of the alternative ways to fund this program was to have it as part of your property taxes, everybody's taxes would go up proportional to the value of their property.

Mr. Mott: The way that the state code is written the charge is supposed to be based on the amount of damage being done to the property.

Mr. Stubbs: We spent over a year setting up the fee structure and we received input from various business and property owners. A task force was appointed and we were charged with coming up with a program that would spread the cost and be acceptable to everybody. We took the number of residences in Clark County and divided up the cost of the program and came up with the fee structure.

Mr. Stubbs: There were two choices, the fee could be added as a tax and put on the assessment of your house which I was personally against, as a fee businesses would be able to deduct it as a business expense. If it was added to our property tax we still wouldn't be able to deduct it on our taxes. The task force felt it would be better as a fee and that we would also develop an incentive program, we are still trying to figure out how to implement an incentive program.

Mr. Courtney: Where does the County dump what they take out of the catch basins?

Mr. Giese: The County has constructed a facility called the Decant facility. The material that comes from street sweeping, catch basins, pumping out drywells and storm drains is taken to that facility. The liquids are held in a pond and discharged into the sanitary sewer system. The solids, which are tested for pollutants, are sent to a special landfill for low level hazardous waste. The remainder is used for compost, fill or taken to a landfill.

Mr. Courtney: Where is the money spent that comes from the outlying areas?

Mr. Agard: The money is used to clean roads and ditches. Our job is to see that the money goes to where the greatest needs are.

Mr. Wolford: My bill went up almost 90% can you tell me if next year it will go up again? It went from \$16.00 to \$33.00.

Mr. Rowell: Staff will take your information and get back to you after we have had a chance to research your account.

Ms. Mitchell: I feel that the little guy is paying more than the big guy and I'm still complaining how Clark County will allow that. When it rains my backyard is filled with water. When I attended the Clean Water Commission in August of last year Mr. Agard stated that you were on the committee because you didn't agree with the set up on who paid the most and who paid the least. I believe it was you Ms. Rasmussen who said that the fee was not cemented in. Why should I have to deal with all the neighbors run off onto my property?

Ms. Rasmussen: Ms Mitchell if you will leave us your phone number Mr. Giese will provide you with some contact numbers.

Mrs. Goetz: This year our clean water fee bill was \$66.00 when prior years it was \$19.80. We have over 50 acres and my mother lives in a mobile home on the same parcel. We want to pay our fair share but do not understand the increase in the fees.

Mr. Rowell: We will look into this issue and contact you with the results.

BOCC/CWC Luncheon

Mr. Rowell noted that there were three follow up items that came out of the Board of County Commission and Clean Water Commission luncheon on June 17:

1. Paying off the road fund loan, which is about \$880,000. The amount of dollars in the fund balance is a little over 6 million. If you choose to pay off the loan, those dollars would go into the general fund.
2. Clean Water Program Fee incentives. The Board of County Commissioners has stated that they have not taken any action regarding the incentive issue. This Commission may want to consider the issue and offer other incentives or ideas.
3. Fund Balance dollars, which are reserved for capital projects however, this Commission, does have input on how those dollars are utilized.

Mr. Agard: I would be interested in looking at paying back our loan into the general fund. However, I would like to wait until all Commissioners are present before making a decision.

Ms. Rasmussen: Mr. Rowell would you put this as an agenda item for the next Clean Water Commission Meeting (August 6, 2003).

Capital Improvement

Mr. Agard: I think this Commission needs more time to review the capital improvement projects and I would like to hear more from the Sub-committee. I'm having a hard time trying to figure out a way to measure one project against another.

Mr. Giese: The sub-committee went through an arduous process to rank the capital projects. It sounds as though we need to continue this discussion in September, I will be on vacation during the August meeting.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on August 6, @ 6:30 p.m., Public Works Maintenance and Operations Conference Room

Adjourn

The Clean Water Commission meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectively Submitted,

Kelli Frost

H:\Frost\CWC\meeting notes and agenda\Meeting Notes\2003 CWC meeting notes\070203 cwc notes.doc